

## REMARKS

In response to the Official Action dated 4/23/2003, the above-identified application has been amended. Review and reconsideration are requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

The Examiner objected to the drawings as not showing all reference signs mentioned in the specification, i.e. number "28". Applicant has amended the drawings and the amended formal drawings will be sent under separate cover, copy here attached. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7-12, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as anticipated by Ziu. The examiner stated that Ziu included the claimed elements.

Applicant has amended the claims and respectfully submits that the amended claims are no longer anticipated by Ziu. Specifically, Ziu does not disclose, teach or suggest a carrier pipe section having a plurality of radially spaced centralizer fins fixably connected to and longitudinally extending along an outer surface thereof in a manner which prevents movement thereof with respect to the carrier pipe only such that the carrier pipe and fins slides as a unit within the containment pipe nor does Ziu disclose, teach or suggest a containment pipe section having a plurality of radially spaced centralizer fins fixably connected to and longitudinally extending along an inner surface thereof in a manner which prevents movement thereof with respect to the containment pipe only such that the carrier pipe slides on the fins within the containment pipe. Further, Ziu does not teach of containment pipes which are removably interconnected which contain carrier pipes which are fixably connected to one another such that the carrier pipes may slide on their centralizer fins within the containment pipes. Ziu states that the ends of the

containment pipes are fused together, i.e., not removably interconnected by a clamp.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Ziu in view of Ewen et al. It was stated that Ewen et al. teach of a quick connect clamp.

While Ewen et al. teach of a clamp, they do so for the purpose of holding the ends of the containment pipes together so that the ends can be welded together rendering a fixed connection of the containment pipe and after which they are removed (col. 8 lines 58-60). This is contrasted with the present invention which uses clamps with seals to hold the containment pipes together in a sealed manner and if removed would disconnect the containment pipes. The use of the clamps in Ewen et al. does not provide a motivation to use them in Ziu and even if one did, it would not provide the instant invention. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 6 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Ziu in view of Selby '066. It was stated that Selby teaches of a leak detection device.

Applicant would agree that Selby teaches a leak detection device, but that adding a leak detection device with the teaching of Ziu does not provide the claimed invention for the reasons stated above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, the remaining claims are respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguished over the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested and allowance of claims 1, 3, 5-6, 9, 11, and 13-14 is requested at as early a date as possible. This is intended to be complete response to the Official Action dated 4/23/2003

Respectfully submitted

R. William Graham, R.N. 33,891

**Certificate of Transmission**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being faxed to the PTO fax number 703-872-9302 for group 3679 on the date shown below.



Date. June 3, 2003